

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 201 281

HE 013 760

AUTHOR Shapiro, Joan P.: And Others
 TITLE The Development of a Transportable Leadership and Management Program in Higher Education.
 PUB DATE Apr 81
 NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Los Angeles, CA, April 13-17, 1981).
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; *Administrators; Change Agents; *College Administration; *Evaluation Methods; *Females; Higher Education; *Leadership Training; Models; Occupational Mobility; Pilot Projects; Private Colleges; Program Implementation; Self Concept; Seminars; State Universities; Urban Universities; Workshops

ABSTRACT

The impact of an evaluation design on the effective implementation of a training program for women in higher education leadership and management was assessed. The program was designed by the University of Pennsylvania's Higher Education Resource Services. The training program, entitled "The Next Move," was introduced at three pilot sites: a large, public urban institution, part of a multi-campus system; a small, private university in a suburban setting; and a senior college of an urban public university system. To increase chances for career mobility for women and to assist in the development of a positive self-image, the program utilized leadership and management training to provide women with an institutional perspective, strengthen and encourage local leadership, and foster the growth of networks. The program consisted of a one-half day case study workshop, a one-day leadership and management clinic, and brown bag seminars. To insure implementation of the model on a nationwide basis, it was necessary that the evaluative design consider the special problems of a model focusing on institutional change, while carefully appraising the potential adaptability or transportability of the program. The evaluation design selected was illuminative evaluation, which encompassed both process and product components and the collection of quantitative and qualitative data. Because the program was designed in three stages, formative evaluation was easily built into the evaluative model. Quantitative data were obtained through a questionnaire, administered after the case study workshop and qualitative data were obtained through observations and interviews. Results of the evaluation are considered. (SW)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED201281

The Development of a Transportable Leadership
and Management Program for Women in Higher Education

Joan P. Shapiro .

Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania
and Higher Education Resource Services, Mid-Atlantic

Cynthia Secor and Ann Butchart

Higher Education Resource Services, Mid-Atlantic
University of Pennsylvania
3601 Locust Walk
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. P. Shapiro

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Prepared for the 1981 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 13-17, 1981, in Los Angeles, California. Preparation of this paper was supported by a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (Grant #G007903995). The authors would like to thank Shirley Stimpson and Marge Brannon for their assistance in preparing the manuscript.

HE 013 760

Introduction

One of the most satisfying achievements of an educator is the successful introduction of an innovative program whose long range impact can dramatically affect the institution. Such achievements of this kind are rare, due to the inherent problems of program design, as well as the difficulties of adequate, comprehensive evaluation. Clearly, when the program is sophisticated and change-oriented, it must be matched by an equally complex evaluative design in order to accurately assess the program's impact.

This paper addresses itself to questions surrounding the design and implementation of an innovative program, and it examines the role of illuminative evaluation in assessing the success of the model. The program, The Next Move, is change-oriented and focuses on the role of women in higher education.

The structure of post-secondary education, in many respects, mirrors other institutions in our culture. The pyramid model of authority finds men at the apex, supported by large numbers of women in lower levels of authority and power. Van Alstyne and Withers (1977) determined that only 16 per cent of all administrative positions in higher education were occupied by women, despite the fact that the majority of American post-secondary students are now female (Cowan, 1980).

In previous projects, focussing on women in higher education, the program developer, of this study, had concluded that women's careers were hindered as much by their own negative self-perceptions as by institutional barriers. Women frequently believed that their professional skills were inadequate, even in the face of contrary evidence.

The Next Move was designed to address the slow pace of career mobility for women in post-secondary institutions and the importance of developing a positive self-concept. To increase chances for mobility and assist in the development of a positive self-image, the program utilized leadership and management training as a vehicle to: provide women with an institutional perspective; strengthen and encourage local leadership; and foster the growth of networks.

The program developer and the external evaluator of The Next Move, in introducing the model on three pilot sites, felt that illuminative evaluation would reveal the complexities of the model and highlight the strengths and weaknesses associated with its implementation. Illuminative evaluation, as defined by Parlett and Hamilton (1978), "takes account of the wider contexts in which educational programs function. Its primary concern is with description and interpretation rather than measurement and prediction" (p. 10). Illuminative evaluation was expected to test the program's adaptability or transport-

ability from site to site.

Purpose of the Study

In this paper, two major questions are considered:

- (1) Can a model training program for women administrators be sufficiently transportable to meet the varied needs of individual participants and the requirements of particular institutions?
- (2) Can the assessment approach, known as "illuminative" evaluation, enhance the impact of the program and the transportability of the original model?

Description of the Pilot Program

HERS (Higher Education Resource Services), Mid-Atlantic, an office housed at the University of Pennsylvania, designed and implemented The Next Move. The program consists of three parts: Part I is a one and one-half day Case Study Workshop focussing on issues facing post-secondary women administrators; Part II is a one day Leadership and Management Clinic designed to expand upon issues identified in Part I; Part III is composed of five "Brown Bag" Seminars, held at two-week intervals, addressing topics selected by the participants. The workshop and clinic are conducted by facilitators and staff external to the institution, assisted by co-facilitators from the campus. A local coordinator selects

the co-facilitators, arranges for campus facilities, and invites women participants. These are drawn from four different groups: support staff, entry-level administration, mid-level administration and faculty.

The strength of The Next Move, as a professional education program, is derived from two key design innovations: the inclusion of diverse women from all areas of the institution, and the fact that the program's ultimate outcome is determined by the participants themselves. The Next Move involves women in an extended learning program emphasizing career development and an institutional perspective. The participants, who traditionally share the same employer, but little else, are encouraged to develop networks and a sense of interdependence.

The Next Move was introduced to the Mid-Atlantic region at three pilot campuses. These campuses were selected to challenge the model's design; thus, the institutions were intentionally diverse. Site A was a large public institution, part of a multi-campus system, in an urban setting. Site B, a small, private university in a quiet suburban setting, was the only one of the three institutions currently experiencing expansion. Site C was the senior college of an urban public university system beset by declining enrollment and drastic budget reductions. In May and June, 1980, one-hundred and five women, at the three pilot institutions, participated in Parts I and II of the model.

In September, 1980, the Planning Committee, at each of the sites, organized the third phase of the program, The Brown Bag Seminars, focussing on topics selected by the participants themselves.

The pilot study for The Next Move has now been completed, and the program is available for nationwide introduction.

Rationale for the Evaluation of the Pilot Program

For implementing the model on a nationwide basis, it was essential that the evaluative design consider the special problems of a model focussing on institutional change, while carefully appraising the potential adaptability or "transportability" of the program.

With respect to implementation of a model for change, such as The Next Move, current literature stressed the need to focus on the process of planned innovation (Berman and McLaughlin, 1975). To facilitate implementation, The Next Move's design provided a period of time to elapse between each of its three stages; additionally, it proceeded from an externally-administered to an internally-directed program. The program also acknowledged the need for on-site leadership by utilizing personnel from the host institution (Pincus and Williams, 1979). Indeed, with the development of the program, the host campus' coordinator and co-facilitator were requested to become more involved with The Next Move and they assumed responsibility for the program's continuation.

To effectively disseminate this program, the model emphasized the concept of "transportability". Used in this paper, "transportability" is close to the notion of "exportability" (Klein, 1974) or the more currently employed term of "adaptability", i.e., "the extent to which critical elements of an innovation can be implemented at other sites" (Graeber, 1980, p. 14). Fullan and Pomfret (1977) noted two attributes related to transportability: "explicitness or plans for explicitness" and "complexity or degree of difficulty of change required by an innovation" (p. 368). The evaluative design, to determine "transportability" of the model, would have to include a study of the explicitness of the program and any necessary modification, as well as the degree and complexity of change as determined by the program's participants.

Illuminative Evaluation

To judge the impact of The Next Move as a model for change and to ascertain its transportability, the choice of an evaluative framework was a crucial decision. It was decided to use illuminative evaluation. This mode of evaluation would best provide answers to the complex questions which the program developer wished to have answered. In addition, this form of evaluation has been specifically recommended for the assessment of innovatory programs.

As defined by Parlett and Hamilton (1978), "illuminative evaluation is not a standard methodological package, but a general strategy. It

aims to be both adaptable and eclectic. The choice of research tactics follows not from research doctrine, but from decisions in each case as to the best available techniques: the problem defines the methods used, not vice versa" (p. 13).

This flexibility of research approaches was compatible with the components of the program envisioned by the designer. In fact, it seemed especially appropriate for two reasons: (1) since the sites were intended as pilots, the program developer wished to have the widest range of response available to strengthen the model; (2) as a training program, The Next Move required that participants accept the program fully and agree to assume responsibility for the final phase of the model. Accordingly, recognition of participants' diverse reactions to the model was necessary to assure the program's full implementation.

An illuminative assessment model, encompassing both process and product components and combining the collection of quantitative and qualitative data, was developed. Because The Next Move was designed in three stages, formative evaluation was easily built into the evaluative model. "In-house" reports were provided by the evaluator to give continual feedback to the program developer for:

- a) the next stage of the design, on a particular campus, so that it could better meet the needs of the participants;
- b) the refinement of a particular stage which would then be implemented on another site.

Quantitative data was elicited through a questionnaire, administered after the Case Study Workshop (Part I) at all three sites. At the conclusion of the Brown Bag Seminars, further information was collected through a final questionnaire. The combined information provided a pre-and post-test to determine if program objectives and participant expectations were achieved. At the beginning of each cycle, quantitative information was also obtained through a needs assessment which was completed, tabulated and returned to the coordinators at the individual sites. This information was used by campus organizers to develop the direction and objectives for future interactions.

Qualitative data was obtained through observations and interviews. As a participant observer, the evaluator attended all first and second cycle sessions. Field notes were taken and were used to provide relevant information to the project developer. After each stage of the model, the evaluator held telephone interviews, using a structured format, with selected facilitators and participants. Data was categorized and presented to the project developer. Triangulation was also utilized to provide qualitative information. After the initial Case Study Workshop, it was found to be a useful mechanism for assessment. In this instance, the comments of external facilitators and internal group leaders were compared and contrasted.

Results

To determine the success of Part I, the Case Study Workshop, which was at the core of the program, participants were asked to indicate their satisfaction on the questionnaire. The number of participants who were either "very" or "extremely" satisfied with the workshop (the two highest indicators), increased from site to site (i.e. Site A-42.0%; Site B-45.5%; Site C-65.7%), due in large part to alterations in the model as a result of participants' criticisms.

Dissatisfaction, which was relayed to the program developer through formative evaluation, centered around three areas discussed below: segregation of the groups, responsibilities of the co-facilitators, and the workshop presentations of the program developer.

(1) Segregation of the Groups - The program developer separated participants in Part I according to their occupations. Participants at Site A objected strenuously to the segregation of groups and charged that "elitism" had occurred. Aware of this difficulty, yet reluctant to change the original design, the program developer announced at the next two sites that participants would meet in mixed groups in Part II. Using the formative evaluation information, and indicating the resulting change in participant mix, follow-up interviews showed that segregation of groups was no longer an issue.

(2) Responsibility of the Co-Facilitators - Implicit in The Next Move design was the gradual emergence of leadership and direction from

the host institution, and it was hoped that the co-facilitators would evolve into key leaders. However, after Part I, it was evident that co-facilitators on Site A felt unprepared for the workshop and had begun to worry about their role in Part II. At Site B, there was a further expression of this anxiety. To deal with the crucial issues of role definition, the program developer described the co-facilitators' responsibilities at each stage of the model, and presented the outline prior to Part I. Follow-up interviews confirmed that co-facilitators' concerns were alleviated once their role in the model was made explicit.

(3) Workshop Presentations of the Program Developer - The program developer delivered three 30-minute presentations in Part I. Comments were made, both orally and on the questionnaire, that the talks would be more easily remembered if a summary were provided. Responding to her own perception of the presentations and to participants' reactions, the program developer produced an agenda, outlining the talks and providing related topics for group discussion.

The questionnaire, administered after Part I, asked participants to indicate professional development areas which they wished to pursue. Although the majority of participants at all sites selected Management and Leadership Skills as their first topic of concern, the remaining development areas varied considerably from site to site.

Accordingly, Part II of the model reflected the collective interests of the participants in a given institution. For example, at Site A, career planning and human behavior skills had a high priority and were a major focus of discussion; on Site B, job design, supervision, performance assessment and communication skills received attention; on Site C, communications and human behavior skills were stressed. Thus, transportability was demonstrated. The model was sufficiently flexible to permit consideration of site specific topics of interest.

The Next Move's participants were responsible for selecting discussion topics for the Brown Bag Seminars (Part III). The model mirrored the previous activities and level of consciousness on an individual campus and was therefore considered to be adaptive. In this case, on one traditional campus, participants focused on the need to post available positions on a bulletin board, while on another more non-traditional site, participants indicated a desire to organize a Women's Action Alliance.

The adaptability of the model was also clearly demonstrated in the manner in which each campus changed the final stage of the program. The coordinator and her committee, at Site B, implemented Part III as designed. The brown bag luncheons were held two weeks apart and attendance was restricted to the original participants.

For the luncheons, the theme of communications was selected and a seminar series relating to this topic was devised. Such titles as "Selling Ideas or Making the Boss Listen" and "Bring Your Boss to Lunch" indicated clearly the thrust of these sessions.

At Site A, there was a reduction in the number of luncheons from five to three and colleagues were invited who were outside of the original program. On this campus, the brown bag sessions emphasized professional development. In this case, support systems for women; private sector jobs; and financial planning were the topics of the three luncheons.

On Campus C, the Brown Bag Seminars were used as a springboard for the formation of a new campus-wide organization of women. For the seminars, no central focus was noticeable. Instead, the monthly meetings ranged from a panel discussion with four women deans, to a Christmas party, to as unusual a presentation as "The Medieval Woman and Her Work." Attendance at each session was very good and the meetings were of interest to women from all parts of the university. It was noted that some of the original participants, in the secretarial group, as a direct outgrowth of the program, developed an informal support group.

Discussion of the Results

The Next Move is an exceptionally complex model for change. Variables abound. Thus, the sites are very different; women are at diverse stages of their professional development and at varied levels of consciousness; opportunities for individual growth on each campus differ. Despite the variables, the model thus far appears to be transportable. It can be adjusted both to the needs of participants and to the requirements of the different institutions.

Evidence in support of the model's adaptability can be seen in the willingness of the program developer to write more explicit material for Part I; in the modification of Part II to suit the needs of the participants; in the variations which enabled participants to tailor the luncheons in Part III to reflect their own interests.

Illuminative Evaluation and Transportability

The selection of illuminative evaluation to assess the impact of The Next Move proved to be of critical significance. Had only traditional evaluative methods been employed, it is doubtful that the model could have been refined as it moved from site to site, or that the unintended consequences of the program's outcome would have been revealed.

It was the British philosopher, Carl Popper, who recognized that for each intended action, there are some unintended consequences (Magee, 1973). In a process model for change, such as The Next Move, unintended and unexpected consequences were inevitable. Since participants were able to shape some of the program's parts, the design was left deliberately open-ended. Illuminative evaluation, which is both adaptable and eclectic, provided the external assessor with necessary methodologies to properly describe the most obvious results of the program, as well as the unanticipated consequences.

Although it was expected that a program, focussing on career development, would alter mobility and job enhancement for its participants, the program developer did not anticipate the speed at which changes would occur. Within ten months of the program's introduction, 20% of the one-hundred and five original women reported positive career changes (i.e. new and expanded responsibilities, new titles, different posts, non-scheduled salary increases).

It is difficult to establish a casual relationship between participation in The Next Move and career changes; however, typical comments from the different sites, such as the following, would strongly suggest a causative relationship.

"It (The Next Move) helped me make up my mind to make a change in position of twenty-five years plus!"

"I moved from Personnel to Law School. I would not have bid on the job last Spring."

"I am currently initiating a request for reclassification and up-grading of my current position."

"I have prioritized my responsibilities and resolved to take on more administrative work - to change direction and look at academic administration."

It is interesting to note that follow-up questionnaires only partially elicited information on career mobility. It was telephone interviewing, one approach available in illuminative evaluation, which enabled the evaluator to learn of career changes.

Another interesting finding concerned the concept of networking. Although the program was designed to foster the development of networks among participants, the extent to which women at Site C would assist each other was unanticipated. On this campus, two support groups, with different but related functions, emerged to serve the faculty level women and secretarial employees. Both groups have continued to meet often and offer advice and assistance to participants. Once again, questionnaire data did not demonstrate the formation of these two groups. Inter-

views of the on-site coordinator and of past participants revealed this finding.

In summary, this paper attempted to establish the relationship between effective implementation of an innovative program, The Next Move, and its evaluative design. The Next Move is a process model for change and as such required an assessment design in which product evaluation alone would not suffice. In addition, the evaluative design needed to be sufficiently flexible to cope with unpredictable outcomes. With this in mind, illuminative evaluation was used to provide for the program developer the information necessary to modify the model from stage to stage and from site to site. In this way, the model was able to become transportable to meet more closely the varied needs of individual participants, as well as the requirement of particular institutions. Illuminative evaluation also revealed unintended consequences, which helped to confirm the program's positive impact on career mobility and on the development of support groups.

References

- Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M.W. Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. IV: The findings in review. Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation, 1975.
- Cowan, R.B. Higher education has obligations to a new majority. The Chronicle of Higher Education, June 1980, 48.
- Fullan, M., & Pomfret, A. Research on curriculum and instruction implementation. Review of Educational Research, 1977, 47(2), 335-397.
- Graeber, A.O. A basic skills instructional improvement program: Utilizing research to facilitate implementation and dissemination. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Boston: April, 1980.
- Klein, S.S. NIE product rating form. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1974.
- Magee, B. Popper. Glasgow, Scotland: Fontana Modern Masters, 1973.
- Parlett, M. & Hamilton, D. Evaluation as illumination: a new approach to the study of innovatory programs. Beyond the Numbers Game. Hamilton, D. et. al. (eds.) London: MacMillan 1978, 6-22.
- Pincus, J., & Williams, R.C. Planned change in urban school districts. Phi Delta Kappan, 1979, 60 (10), 729-33.
- Van Alstyne, C., & Withers, J.S. Women and men in the administration of higher education institutions: employment patterns and compensations. Washington, D.C.: College and University Personnel Association, 1977.